

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

vs.

RICHARD LEE SATERSTAD,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:15-cr-00125-APG-GWF

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Defendant's Motion to Reconsider Order on Motion for Bill of Particulars (#36), filed on October 7, 2015.

Defendant moves the Court to reconsider its order denying a Bill of Particulars. Defendant represents that the information sought in the Bill of Particulars is necessary to properly prepare for trial. "Reconsideration is appropriate if the court (1) is presented with newly discovered evidence; (2) committed clear error or the initial decision was manifestly unjust; or (3) if there is an intervening change in controlling law." *Frasure v. United States*, 256 F.Supp. 2d 1180, 1183 (D. Nev. 2004) quoting *School Dist. No. 1J Multnomah County, Or. v. AcandS, Inc.*, 5 F.3d 1255, 1263 (9th Cir. 1993). Defendant does not offer any reasons beyond those already argued in his initial Motion for a Bill of Particulars (#22). His initial motion requested information that went beyond the requirements of an indictment, and the Court found that a Bill of Particulars was unnecessary. Upon reconsideration, the Court finds that a Bill of Particulars is still unnecessary, as Defendant is adequately informed of the charges against him. Accordingly,

...

...

...

1 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion to Reconsider Order on Motion for
2 Bill of Particulars (#36) is **denied**.

3 **DATED** this 13th day of November, 2015.

4
5 

6 _____
7 GEORGE FOLEY, JR.
8 United States Magistrate Judge
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28